

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

Claims 15-30 are pending in this application. Claims 15, 16, 19, 20, 23, 24, 27, and 28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by U.S. patent application publication 2002/0032907 to Daniels. Claims 17, 18, 21, 22, 25, 26, 29, and 30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Daniels in view of the vCalendar Specification, v0.4 (herein “the vCalendar Specification”).

Addressing the above-noted rejections, those rejections are traversed by the present response as discussed next.

Each of the independent claims is amended by the present response to clarify features recited therein. Specifically, independent claim 15 now recites the server configured to store a program table “simultaneously displaying a plurality of programs with additional respective request buttons for record reservation data, such that each displayed program has a corresponding unique request button for record reservation data simultaneously displayed with the respective displayed program”. The other independent claims are similarly amended. That subject matter is believed to be clear for example from Figure 16 in the present specification.

As shown for example in Figure 16 in the present specification data (Electronic Program Guide (EPG)) to display a screen such as shown for example in Figure 16 is sent by an external apparatus (a server). Such a display is a program table simultaneously displaying programs each with an additional respective unique request button for record reservation data 251. That is, a different request button for record reservation data 251 is provided for each respective individual program to allow selecting of the individual programs, all of the record reservation data buttons 251-1 to 251-11 being simultaneously displayed with their respective programs. A user can review that program table and select programs on the program table by

selecting one of the respective request buttons for record reservation data 251 on the program table corresponding to a respective program. The server can then transmit record reservation data to a remote device based on the user selection of the request buttons for record reservation data on the program table. That is, the data (the EPG Program) sends a signal that requests the scheduling data of one program according to a respective pressed request button for record reservation data to the external apparatus (server). Thereby, the record reservation can be downloaded to a user.

With such a structure the volume of the EPG data received at one time can be decreased as only the data is provided corresponding to one selected program based on one selected request button for record reservation data. Thereby, scheduling of a television program can be realized even with a communication line with a slow transmission rate.

Applicants respectfully submit the above-noted features clarified in the claims distinguish over the applied art.

Applicants respectfully submit Daniels does not disclose or suggest the features clarified in the claims to the display directed to the stored program table. Specifically, applicants submit Daniels does not disclose or suggest storing a program table:

...simultaneously displaying a plurality of programs with additional respective request buttons for record reservation data, such that each displayed program has a corresponding unique request button for record reservation data simultaneously displayed with the respective displayed program [.]

Applicants submit Daniels does not disclose or suggest that any program table ***simultaneously displays*** a plurality of programs ***each with a respective unique request button for record reservation data***. Again with reference to Figure 16 in the present specification as a non-limiting example, a display according to the present invention simultaneously displays a plurality of programs each with an additional respective unique request button for record reservation 251.

In maintaining the outstanding rejection based on Daniels, the outstanding Office Action explains certain interpretations taken to the previously recited claim language and why such claim language is still met by Daniels. Although applicants believe the claims as previously written were clear in their recitations, the claims have been further amended herein to even further clarify the claims over the previous interpretations of the claims in view of Daniels.

One basis of maintaining the rejection based on Daniels appears to rely on the position that in Daniels as shown in Figure 23 a column F with program schedule information can be displayed, and that once a user selects a program in column F a column G will pop up with the option of recording the program, and that thereby the program table of Figure 23 simultaneously displays “a plurality of programs”, and each program has a corresponding “record button” displayed in the column G. The Office Action notes such a disclosure in Daniels meets the previously recited claim limitations “respective request buttons for record reservation data, such that each displayed program has a corresponding request button for record reservation data”.¹

In reply to that grounds for rejection, applicants initially note the claims recited “*each* displayed program has a *corresponding* request button for record reservation data” (emphasis added). Applicants submit that language should have properly been interpreted to distinguish over Daniels as Daniels does not disclose that *each* program noted in column F has a *corresponding* record reservation button as in Daniels, particularly as the Office Action even recognized that in Daniels only a single record button in column G is provided.

Moreover, the claims are herein amended to now even further distinguish over the above-noted interpretation in Daniels. Specifically, the claims now clarify each displayed program has a “corresponding *unique* request button for recording reservation data”

¹ Office Action of April 14, 2008, the paragraph bridging pages 2 and 3.

(emphasis added). The above-noted interpretation of Daniels in which a single record button in column G is provided for all the programs does *not* correspond to such a claimed feature.

One further basis for maintaining the rejection indicates the previously recited claim language “does not require that all of the plurality of programs at all of the respective request buttons be displayed simultaneously”.²

Again applicants note the claims as previously written were believed to be clear in that respect, but the claims are also herein amended to further clarify that each display program “has a corresponding unique request button for record reservation data *simultaneously displayed with the respective displayed program*” (emphasis added). The above-noted claim amendments are believed to even further distinguish over the interpretation of the claims and Daniels set forth in the outstanding Office Action.

One further basis of interpreting Daniels to correspond to the claim limitations was that the program buttons 1-22 in Column F of Daniels could also be interpreted as “request buttons for record reservation data”.³

In reply to that grounds for rejection, applicants note the claims previously clearly recited displaying a plurality of programs *with respective request buttons* for record reservation data, and applicants respectfully submit no reasonable interpretation would indicate the displayed programs themselves were also request buttons. However, to even further distinguish over that interpretation of the previously recited claim language, the claims now clarify “simultaneously displaying a plurality of programs with *additional* respective request buttons for record reservation data” (emphasis added). Such claim features are believed to even further distinguish the claims over the previous interpretation of the claims in view of Daniels.

² Office Action of April 14, 2008, page 3, lines 15-16.

³ Office Action of April 14, 2008, page 4, first paragraph.

Applicants again draw attention Figure 16 in the present specification as a non-limiting example. In contrast to Daniels, in the claims as written each of the different programs simultaneously displayed includes its own respective unique and separate button 251-1 to 251-11, which are each a request button for record reservation data. Applicants submit Daniels does not disclose or suggest such features.

In view of the present response applicants respectfully submit the claims as currently written clearly distinguish over Daniels.

Moreover, no teachings in the vCalendar Specification were cited with respect to the above-discussed features, and no teachings in the vCalendar Specification are believed to cure the above-discussed deficiencies in Daniels.

As no other issues are pending in this application, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and it is hereby respectfully requested that this case be passed to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Bradley D. Lytle
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 40,073

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 08/07)
SNS/rac

Surinder Sachar
Registration No. 34,423